

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON
PORTLAND DIVISION

PARK & FLANDERS, LLC, a Delaware
limited liability company,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROBERT C. BREWSTER, JR.,
individually,

Defendant.

ROBERT C. BREWSTER, JR.,
individually,

Counter-Plaintiff,

v.

BRIAN PEARCE, individually, **UNICO, INC.**, and **PARK & FLANDERS, LLC**,
a Delaware limited liability company,

Counter-Defendants.

MOSMAN, J.,

On September 17, 2014, Magistrate Judge Jelderks entered his Findings and Recommendation [49] (“F&R”) in the above captioned case. Judge Jelderks recommended that Mr. Robert Brewster, Jr.’s Motion for Summary Judgment [36] be denied for the reasons set out in the F&R. No objections were filed.

No. 3:12-cv-01636-JE

OPINION AND ORDER

DISCUSSION

The magistrate judge makes only recommendations to the court, to which any party may file written objections. The court is not bound by the recommendations of the magistrate judge, but retains responsibility for making the final determination. The court is generally required to make a de novo determination regarding those portions of the report or specified findings or recommendation as to which an objection is made. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). However, the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the magistrate judge as to those portions of the F&R to which no objections are addressed. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003). While the level of scrutiny under which I am required to review the F&R depends on whether or not objections have been filed, in either case, I am free to accept, reject, or modify any part of the F&R. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C).

Upon review, I agree with Judge Jelderk's recommendation, and I ADOPT the F&R [49] as my own opinion.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 10th day of October, 2014.

/s/ Michael W. Mosman
MICHAEL W. MOSMAN
United States District Judge